

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to a Final Office action dated July 10, 2006. Claims 1, 3-7, 12-18, 20-27, and 41-52 were examined. Claims 1, 3-7, 12 – 15, 17, 18, 20, 22 – 25, 27, and 42 have been rejected. Applicant has amended the claims to put the matter in condition for allowance.

The Office has stated that claim 41 is allowed. The Office has objected to claims 16, 21, 26, 41, and 43 – 52 as having allowable subject matter, but objected to for being dependent on a rejected parent claims. Applicant notes that claim 41 has been identified as both allowed and objected. However, claim 41 is an independent claim, thus is not dependent on any parent claim. Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 41 is allowed and the indication of objected status is incorrect. Claims 6, 16, 21, 26, and 42 have been cancelled.

Applicant has amended claims 12, 18, 22, and 43 to put the claims in condition for allowance. Applicant has also amended claims 28, 32, and 38 to respectively depend from claims 22, 43, and 41. Claims 28 and 32 have also been amended to avoid antecedent basis errors.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 12-15, 18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,529,727 to Findikli et al. (hereinafter, “Findikli”).

Applicant has incorporated the limitations of claim 6 into claim 1, and cancelled claim 6. Claim 6 was rejected over Findikli. However, the Office Action only refers to the first limitation of claim 6, and never states that all limitations of claim 6 are disclosed by Findikli. Moreover, the rejection merely states in parenthesis “reads on claim 6” after quoting only the first limitation of claim 6 on page 2 of the Office Action. Findikli fails to disclose or suggest “said at least one assigned operating parameter comprises an International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI)” as recited in amended claim 1. To anticipate a claim, every limitation must be found in the reference. The recited subject matter is not disclosed or suggested by Findikli. Amended claim 1 is allowable over the art of record.

Claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 1. Claims 8, 9, and 11 have also been amended to avoid antecedent basis errors.


None of the art of record discloses or suggests any of the claims.

Conclusion

In summary, claims 1, 3 – 5, 7 – 15, 17 – 18, 20, 22 – 25, 27 – 41, and 43 – 52 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

<p><u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION</u></p> <p>I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed as shown above.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.</p> <p>_____ Date</p>

Respectfully submitted,


Steven R. Gilliam, Reg. No. 51,734
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(512) 338-6320 (direct)
(512) 338-6300 (main)
(512) 338-6301 (fax)

<p>EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: _____</p>
